# **APPENDIX G**

# California Environmental Quality Act Negative Declaration/Initial Study

CDFG Notice of Completion (Signed and SCH Stamped)

CDFG Negative Declaration (Signed and SCH Stamped)

CEQA Environmental Checklist Form



# DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME http://www.dfg.ca.gov



State Clearinghouse 1400 Tenth Street Sacramento, California 95814



November 16, 2009

Proposed Negative Declaration for the draft Land Management Plan for the Hallelujah Junction Wildlife Area.

Enclosed are the Notice of Completion (NOC) and 17 copies of the proposed Environmental Checklist/Negative Declaration for the Management Plan for the Hallelujah Junction Wildlife Area.

Based upon the Initial Study/Environmental Checklist, the Department of Fish and Game has determined that the project will not have a significant effect on the environment. Because this is a proposed Negative Declaration, we request a 30-day review period. Also enclosed is a courteous electronic copy of the land management plan and proposed negative declaration.

If you have any questions or need further information, please contact Mr. Paul Raquel at (916) 358-2868 or Mr. Armand Gonzales at (916) 358-2876.

Sonke Mastrup
Deputy Director

# **Enclosure**

CC:

Mr. Paul Raquel, North Central Region

Mr. Armand Gonzales, North Central Region

Ms. Teresa Le Blanc, Lands Program

# **Notice of Completion & Environmental Document Transmittal**

| Mail to: State Clearinghouse, P. For Hand Delivery/Street Address  |   |   | 016) 445-0613   | SCH#  |
|--|---|---|---|---|
| Project Title: Hallelujah Wildlif  | fe Area Land Management   | Plan  | _   |   |
| Lead Agency: Department of Fis   |   |   | Contact Person: F   | Paul Raquel   |
| Mailing Address: 1701 Nimbus F   |   |   | Phone: 916-358-   |   |
| Separation of the second secon |   | Zip: 95670  | County: Sacram  |   |
| Chy. Italiano Cordova  |   | Zip. <u>93070</u>   | Oddiey. Oddiern   |   |
| Project Location: County: Sier   | ra Co and Lassen Co   | City/Nearest Con  | munity: Cold Spri   | ngs and Reno, NV  |
| Cross Streets: US 395/SR 70  |   |   |   | Zip Code:   |
| Longitude/Latitude (degrees, minut   | es and seconds):°   | '"N/  | ''W1  | Total Acres: 13,394   |
| Assessor's Parcel No.: various, se   | e LMP   | Section:  | Twp.: 21N 22 N  | Range: R17 18 E Base:   |
| Within 2 Miles: State Hwy #: L   | JS 395/SR 70  |   |   | on Creeks   |
| 1900   |   | Railways: Union P   | acific S  | Schools:  |
|  |   |   |   |   |
| I nog Boo (II  | Draft EIR Supplement/Subsequent EIR rior SCH No.) her:  | 7 0 2000  | NOI Other<br>EA<br>Draft EIS<br>FONSI                         | r:  |
| Local Action Type:   | etate Ci  | LEARING HOUSE   | <u> </u>  |   |
| General Plan Update General Plan Amendment   | Specific Plan Master Plan Planned Unit Developmer Site Plan   | Rezone Prezone Use Perm   |   | Annexation Redevelopment Coastal Permit Other: Mngmt Plan   |
| Development Type:  Residential: Units Office: Sq.ft. Commercial:Sq.ft.   | Acres Employees   | Transpo   |   |   |
| Industrial: Sq.ft.   | Acres Employees_  | Power:  | Type  | MW  |
| Educational: Recreational:   |   | Waste 1   | reatment: Type  | MGD   |
| Water Facilities: Type   | MGD   | Other: \  | Vildlife Area   |   |
|  |   |   |   |   |
| Project Issues Discussed in D  | ocument:  |   |   |   |
|  | ☐ Fiscal ☐ Flood Plain/Flooding ☐ Forest Land/Fire Hazard ☐ Geologic/Seismic ☑ Minerals ☐ Noise ☐ Population/Housing Balan ☐ Public Services/Facilities | Solid Waste   | versities<br>ms<br>city<br>(Compaction/Gradir<br>dous         | ✓ Vegetation ✓ Water Quality ✓ Water Supply/Groundwater ✓ Wetland/Riparian □ Growth Inducement ✓ Land Use □ Cumulative Effects □ Other: |
|  |   |   |   |   |
| Present Land Use/Zoning/Gen  | eral Plan Designation:  |   |   |   |
| GF (general forest), None  |   |   |   |   |
| Project Description: (please   | use a separate page if nece   | essary)   |   |   |
| Nevada, and approximately 4  | f the HJWA and its environn<br>Wildlife Area (HJWA) is loca<br>miles south of Hallelujah Ju   | nent as well as an<br>ted in northeaster<br>unction (the inters | evaluation of com<br>n California, appro<br>ection of Highway |   |

Note: The State Clearinghouse will assign identification numbers for all new projects. If a SCH number already exists for a project (e.g. Notice of Preparation or previous draft document) please fill in.

and 22 North, and Range 17 and 18 East on the Evans Canyon and Beckwourth Pass U.S. Geological Survey 7.5 minute topo.

| Reviewing Agencies Checklist   |  |
|--|--|
| Lead Agencies may recommend State Clearinghouse distribution of the agency please of the state of the agency please. | ution by marking agencies below with and "X". e denote that with an "S". |
| Air Resources Board  | Office of Emergency Services   |
| Boating & Waterways, Department of   | Office of Historic Preservation  |
| California Highway Patrol  | Office of Public School Construction                                     |
| Caltrans District #  | Parks & Recreation, Department of  |
| Caltrans Division of Aeronautics   | Pesticide Regulation, Department of                                      |
| Caltrans Planning  | Public Utilities Commission  |
| Central Valley Flood Protection Board  | Regional WQCB #  |
| Coachella Valley Mtns. Conservancy   | X Resources Agency   |
| Coastal Commission   | S.F. Bay Conservation & Development Comm.                                |
| Colorado River Board   | San Gabriel & Lower L.A. Rivers & Mtns. Conservancy                      |
| Conservation, Department of  | San Joaquin River Conservancy  |
| Corrections, Department of   | Santa Monica Mtns. Conservancy   |
| Delta Protection Commission  | State Lands Commission   |
| Education, Department of   | SWRCB: Clean Water Grants  |
| Energy Commission  | SWRCB: Water Quality   |
| Fish & Game Region #   | SWRCB: Water Rights  |
| Food & Agriculture, Department of  | Tahoe Regional Planning Agency   |
| Forestry and Fire Protection, Department of  | Toxic Substances Control, Department of                                  |
| General Services, Department of  | Water Resources, Department of   |
| Health Services, Department of   | ***  |
| Housing & Community Development  | Other:   |
| Integrated Waste Management Board  | Other:   |
| X Native American Heritage Commission  |  |
|  |  |
| Local Public Review Period (to be filled in by lead agency   | )  |
| Starting Date  | Ending Date  |
| Lead Agency (Complete if applicable):  |  |
| Consulting Firm: Sustain Environmental Inc   | Applicant: CA Department of Fish and Game                                |
| Address: 3104 "O" Street   | Address: 1701 Nimbus Road, Suite A                                       |
| City/State/Zip: Sacramento, CA 95816   | City/State/Zip: Rancho Cordova, CA. 95670                                |
| Contact: Rebecca Cull  | Phone:   |
| Phone:   |  |
|  |  |
| Signature of Lead Agency Representative:   | Date: 11/4/09  |

Authority cited: Section 21083, Public Resources Code. Reference: Section 21161, Public Resources Code.



# **APPENDIX G**

# California Environmental Quality Act Negative Declaration/Initial Study

CDFG Negative Declaration CEQA Environmental Checklist Form

# Hallelujah Junction Wildlife Area Land Management Plan NEGATIVE DECLARATION

Pursuant to Sections 15070 and 15071 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) guidelines, the California Department of Fish and Game proposed to adopt this Negative Declaration.

1. Title and Short Description of the Project: Hallelujah Junction Wildlife Area Land Management Plan

The California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) is proposing to adopt an updated land management plan for the Hallelujah Junction Wildlife Area (HJWA) to help guide their planning and operations. The first parcel of the HJWA was purchased in 1989 for the express purpose of protecting the winter range and migration corridors of the Loyalton-Truckee deer herd. The initial land purchase totaled 3,742 acres. Since that time, six additional expansions have brought the total to 13,394 acres. As stated in the original land management plan, the Hallelujah Junction Wildlife Area was purchased by the State of California to (CDFG 1990):

- 1. Preserve critical deer winter range and migration corridors from development.
- 2. Protect, restore, enhance and develop riparian and wetland habitats.
- 3. Provide public use with an emphasis on interpretive and educational use.

The CDFG develops management plans for all its lands. Its purpose in preparing a land management plan (LMP) is multifold:

- 1. To guide management of habitats, species, and programs to achieve the department's mission to protect and enhance wildlife.
- 2. To identify appropriate public uses of the property.
- 3. To serve as a descriptive inventory of fish, wildlife and native plant habitats that occur on or use the property.
- 4. To provide an overview of the property's operation and maintenance, and personnel requirements to implement management goals. It also serves as a budget planning aid for annual regional budget preparation.
- To provide a description of potential and actual environmental impacts and subsequent mitigation that may occur during management, and to provide environmental documentation to comply with state and federal statutes and regulations.

- **2. Location of the Project:** The proposed project is located in northeastern California on the HJWA which is located in portions of Sierra and Lassen Counties. The HJWA is approximately 15 miles north of Reno, Nevada, and approximately 4 miles south of Hallelujah Junction (at the intersection of U.S. Highway 395 and State Highway 70).
- 3. Project Proponent: California Department of Fish and Game
- 4. Said project will not have a significant effect on the environment for the following reasons:

The proposed project is the adoption of an updated LMP, which of itself would cause no environmental impacts. LMP implementation may include actions that would physically alter the environment and these actions were anticipated and analyzed at a programmatic level. Although some LMP elements (restoration and enhancement activities) have the potential for environmental impacts, the LMP was designed with required tasks, protective measures and best management practices that, when implemented, avoid potentially significant impacts. Furthermore, the LMP projects are designed to enhance rather than degrade environmental resources. In addition, all projects that may be implemented in the future as a result of adopting the LMP must be subjected to CEQA review according to CEQA Guidelines Section 15168, in light of the information in this document, to determine if additional CEQA documentation in necessary. The type of additional CEQA review completed would be determined based on CEQA Guidelines Sections 15162-15164.

**5.** As a result thereof, the preparation of an Environmental Impact Report pursuant of CEQA (Division 13 of the Public Resources Code of the State of California) is not required.

In accordance with Section 21082.1 of the California Environmental Quality Act, the California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) has independently reviewed and analyzed the Initial Study and Negative Declaration for the proposed project and finds that the Initial Study and Negative Declaration reflect the independent judgment of the CDFG.

I hereby approve this project:

Sandrahlow

# Hallelujah Junction Land Management Plan CEQA Environmental Checklist Form

| 1. | Project title:<br>Hallelujah Junction Wildlife Area Draft Land M  | lana                                     | gement Plan  |
|----|---|--|--|
| 2. | Lead agency name and address:<br>California Department of Fish and Game,<br>North Central Region<br>1701 Nimbus Road<br>Rancho Cordova, CA 95670  |  |  |
| 3. | Contact person and phone number:<br>Terri Weist, Area Manager, (530) 836-0889   |  |  |
| 4. | Project location: The Hallelujah Junction Wildlife Area (HJWA) California, approximately 15 miles north of R approximately 4 miles south of Hallelujah Jun U.S. 395 and State Highway 70). The HJWA 395 and straddles the Sierra/Lassen County of Township 21 and 22 North, and Range 17 Canyon and Beckwourth Pass U.S. Geologica quadrangles.   | eno,<br>nction<br>is bis<br>Lines<br>and | Nevada, and n (at the intersection of sected east-west by U.S. s. It is located on portions 18 East on the Evans                                 |
| 5. | Project sponsor's name and address:<br>California Department of Fish and Game<br>North Central Region<br>1701 Nimbus Road<br>Rancho Cordova, CA 95670   |  |  |
| 6. | General plan designation:<br>GF (general forest), None  | 7.                                       | Zoning:<br>None  |
| 8. | Description of project: (Describe the whole action limited to later phases of the project, and any sec features necessary for its implementation. Attach  | conda                                    | ry, support, or off-site   |
|    | This project is a draft update of the HJWA La originally prepared in 1990. The HJWA was fi California in 1989 and totaled 3,742 acres. S six additional expansions bringing the total a LMP for this property only addressed the first designed to update the previous plan to incluand to provide guidance for the long-term mand to provide guidance for the long-term mand to provide guidance for the long-term mand to provide guidance for the long-term manufacture. | rst p<br>ince<br>crea<br>crea<br>de tl   | urchased by the state of<br>that time, there have been<br>ge to 13,394. The original<br>uisition. This document is<br>he subsequent acquisitions |
|    | This draft LMP describes the dynamic ecologic goals of the HJWA. The draft LMP contains a the HJWA and its environment as well as an wildlife-related public uses. It is written for a varying degrees of expertise in ecosystem let  | com<br>evalu<br>wide                     | prehensive description of<br>lation of compatible<br>e range of audiences with   |

techniques. As area managers gather more information and data, LMP updating will continue and management goals will be refined and adapted. This LMP consists of five sections:

- I. Introduction
- II. Property Description
- III. Habitats and Species
- IV. Management Goals
- V. Operations and Maintenance

This initial study (IS) was prepared in accordance with the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the State CEQA Guidelines to identify and evaluate the potential environmental impacts of operating the HJWA under the provision of the HJWA LMP. This IS considers the whole of the project, and includes the following components:

- The ongoing operation of the HJWA including the public uses incorporated in this LMP;
- Maintenance activities (e.g., habitat management and agricultural) to sustain the biological communities that provide habitat for wildlife and fisheries resources;
- Minor improvements, such as signage, access control and maintenance and trails that do not involve substantial physical disruption of the Wildlife Area;
- Revegetation and enhancement of shrublands and riparian areas;
- Maintenance of the HJWA structures and facilities;
- Monitoring and educational activities, including scientific research;
- Ongoing coordination with public agencies and private interests consistent with the LMP goals;
- Dissemination of public information regarding the HJWA that may include hardcopy and online data as well as other media;
- Update to HJWA regulations; and
- Enforcement of duly adopted laws and regulations.

The draft LMP serves as a general policy guide for the management of the HJWA, including those project components listed above. Protective measure, avoidance strategies and best management practices were incorporated concurrently with the development of the LMP. These measures help ensure that planned actions described in the LMP, including those to be implemented in the future, will not result in significant environmental impacts. Therefore, the CEQA analysis summarized herein is intended to be adequate for many future projects implemented in a manner consistent with the goals and tasks of the adopted LMP. However, any substantive physical changes not included in the draft LMP project description will receive subsequent review and authorization as necessary.

Because potential physical changes to the HJWA would be a part of subsequent projects that have yet to be conceived, designed, or funded, it is not reasonably possible to evaluate the impacts of any such projects at this time. If a subsequent project is not included within the scope of this LMP (i.e. specific goals and tasks), appropriate analysis and documentation pursuant to CEQA will be conducted prior to action on that project. All projects that may be implemented in the future as a result of adopting the LMP must be subjected to CEQA review according to CEQA Guidelines Section 15168. The appropriate type of additional CEQA documentation completed would be determined based on applicable legal requirements, including CEQA Guidelines Sections 15162-15164. This IS concludes that adoption and implementation of the LMP would result in "less-than-significant impacts" or "no impacts" to the environment.

- 9. Surrounding land uses and setting: (Briefly describe the project's surroundings.)
  The HJWA is bordered by federal lands (Bureau of Land Management on the east, and United States Forest Service, Tahoe National Forest, on the west).
  The City of Santa Clara owns two undeveloped neighboring sections (3 and 9) on the Evans Canyon Quadrangle. Private land use on the north side is primarily grazing lands. Ranches here consist of large cattle and hay operations with houses and multiple outbuildings. Balls Canyon Ranch borders the HJWA's southwestern corner. The residential community of White Lake adjoins the Wildlife Area at the southeastern corner and the commercial outpost at Bordertown shares a common boundary along U.S. 395. Other nearby development consists of industrial parks, homes on large lots and small ranchettes (5-20 acres in size).
- 10. Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement):

  None.

### **ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:**

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

| Aesthetics                    | Agriculture Resources              | Air Quality            |  |
|-------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------|--|
| Biological Resources          | Cultural Resources                 | Geology /Soils         |  |
| Hazards & Hazardous Materials | Hydrology / Water Quality          | Land Use / Planning    |  |
| Mineral Resources             | Noise                              | Population / Housing   |  |
| Public Services               | Recreation                         | Transportation/Traffic |  |
| Utilities / Service Systems   | Mandatory Findings of Significance |                        |  |

# **DETERMINATION:**

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

| x | I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.  |
|---|--|
|   | I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.   |
|   | I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.   |
|   | I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed. |
|   | I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.                                   |

| Signature Signature | 11/18/C9<br>Date |
|---------------------|------------------|
| Signature           | Date             |

#### **EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:**

| I. AESTHETICS Would the project:   | Potentially<br>Significant<br>Impact | Less Than<br>Significant with<br>Mitigation<br>Incorporation | Less Than<br>Significant<br>Impact | No<br>Impact |
|--|--------------------------------------|--|------------------------------------|--------------|
| a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?  | _                                    |  |                                    | Х            |
| b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway? |                                      |  |                                    | X            |
| c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?  |                                      |  | X                                  |              |
| d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?                                    |                                      |  |                                    | х            |

## **DISCUSSION**

# a), b), d) No Impact.

The proposed LMP's goals include optimizing native vegetation, preserving existing agricultural practices and cultural resources and the protection of natural visual resources (LMP, Section IV). The HJWA is not within a state scenic highway, and the proposed LMP does not involve the construction of any new buildings or outdoor lighting. LMP adoption would not adversely affect scenic vistas, damage scenic resources or create adverse lighting that affects day or nighttime views in the area.

# c) Less Than Significant Impact.

Some LMP management tasks would involve minor modifications to the existing landscape (e.g., restoration or enhancement activities, signage, and access improvements). However, LMP adoption and task implementation would improve the overall aesthetic conditions of the HJWA by incorporating protection, management, and enhancement strategies for its natural habitats.

| II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES — In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the project: | Potentially<br>Significant<br>Impact | Less Than<br>Significant with<br>Mitigation<br>Incorporation | Less Than<br>Significant<br>Impact | No<br>Impact |
|---|--------------------------------------|--|------------------------------------|--------------|
| a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?  |                                      |  | X                                  |              |
| b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?  |                                      |  |                                    | X            |
| c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?   |                                      |  |                                    | x            |

#### a) Less Than Significant Impact.

The California Department of Conservation's Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program (2006) depicts the southernmost portion of the HJWA (the area formerly known as the Green Gulch Ranch) as important farmlands (Prime, Statewide importance and Locally Important). Some areas in the northern portion of the HJWA, alongside Long Valley Creek, are depicted as farmlands of Local Importance. The remaining parcels are classified as Grazing Lands or Other (government-owned lands with use restrictions). The nine parcels known as Green Gulch Ranch (LMP II, Table 1) consist of irrigated pastureland and include one 40 acre parcel (APN 021040010) designated by Sierra County as General Forest Land (Sierra County Planning Department 2005). Sierra County's permitted uses for this 40 acre parcel include growing and harvesting of agricultural and forest products, grazing of livestock, single family residences and accessory buildings (ibid.). These land use designations are consistent with the historical use of this property, and for many years, these parcels have been used primarily for livestock grazing. CDFG intends to continue livestock grazing on the property as long as it is appropriate and non-detrimental as part of the overall habitat management plan for the area.

## a) No Impact.

None of the HJWA parcels contain Williamson Act contracts.

#### b) No Impact.

The LMP proposes to maintain a mix of natural communities and agricultural (grazing and hay production) lands on the Wildlife Area. There are no LMP tasks

that would establish any facilities, structures, or land uses that would physically or economically preclude returning the land to cultivation in the future, if there were to be such a public policy decision.

| III. AIR QUALITY Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations.  Would the project:   | Potentially<br>Significant<br>Impact | Less Than<br>Significant with<br>Mitigation<br>Incorporation | Less Than<br>Significant<br>Impact | No<br>Impact |
|---|--------------------------------------|--|------------------------------------|--------------|
| a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?   |                                      |  |                                    | X            |
| b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?  |                                      |  |                                    | Х            |
| c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)? |                                      |  |                                    | Х            |
| d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?  |                                      |  |                                    | Х            |
| e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?   |                                      |  |                                    | Х            |

# DISCUSSION

# a), b), c), d), e) No Impact.

Adoption of the proposed LMP would not generate automobile trips, construction activities, operational pollutants or odor emissions; therefore, adoption of the HJWA LMP would not adversely affect air quality or conflict with the Northern Sierra Air Quality Management District (NSAQMD) air quality plan (NSAQMD 2005). Some of the proposed LMP management tasks may involve the temporary use of construction equipment (e.g., installation of signs, habitat revegetation/restoration projects), and therefore may result in the temporarily increase of equipment emissions. These would be short-term impacts involving a limited number of construction machines and would not contribute to a cumulative net increase in any pollutants. The Wildlife Area is located in a remote portion of eastern California and there are no proposed activities that would expose sensitive receptors to objectionable odors.

| IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES<br>Would the project:   | Potentially<br>Significant<br>Impact | Less Than<br>Significant with<br>Mitigation<br>Incorporation | Less Than<br>Significant<br>Impact | No<br>Impact |
|--|--------------------------------------|--|------------------------------------|--------------|
| a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service? |                                      |  | х                                  |              |
| b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?  |                                      |  | х                                  |              |
| c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?   |                                      |  | X                                  |              |
| d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?   |                                      |  | X                                  |              |
| e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?  |                                      |  |                                    | X            |
| f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?   |                                      |  |                                    | X            |

## a), b), c), d) Less than Significant Impact.

The LMP's goals and tasks provide guidance for CDFG's management of the HJWA for the benefit of the habitats and species found on the sites. The LMP restoration and enhancement activities will improve habitat connectivity and movement corridors for native species and improve wildlife habitat. Wetland and riparian habitat resources are especially valued for wildlife and fish species and the LMP proposes no actions that will remove, fill or disrupt the hydrological conditions that maintain these resources.

Implementation of some of the management actions described in the proposed LMP would involve temporary habitat disturbance, including disturbance to

sensitive and protected riparian and wetland habitats (e.g., revegetation and habitat enhancement activities, access control and maintenance or signage). This disturbance would also have a potential for adverse effects to special-status species (e.g. Northern Goshawk, yellow warbler, willow flycatcher), and fish and wildlife movement corridors. However, all restoration and enhancement actions are designed with the long-term goal of improving habitat conditions, supporting special-status species populations and monitoring for management success (e.g., IVB, Goal 2.1, Tasks 2.1.2-2.14; Goal 3.1, Task 3.1.1; Goal 4.2). In addition, goals and tasks in the LMP require protection measures for sensitive species and habitats which, when implemented, would reduce potential temporary adverse effects to less-than-significant levels (e.g., IVB, 2.1, Task 2.1.4; Goal 5.1, Tasks 5.1.3-5.1.4; Goal 6.1, Tasks 6.1.1-6.1.4).

Furthermore, any of these types of activities would be implemented in conformance with regulatory requirements such as CDFG, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), and State Water Quality Control Board (SWQCB) regulations, as well as Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (CWA), and any applicable plans or ordinances protecting biological resources.

# e), f) No Impact.

There are no Habitat Conservation Plans, Natural Community Conservation Plans or other local policies that conflict with the adoption and implementation of the plan.

In addition, prior to implementation of any projects that are consistent with the LMP, CDFG would subject them to CEQA review according to CEQA Guidelines Section 15168, in light of the information in this document, to determine if additional CEQA documentation in necessary. The type of additional CEQA review completed would be determined based on CEQA Guidelines Sections 15162-15164.

| V. CULTURAL RESOURCES<br>Would the project:   | Potentially<br>Significant<br>Impact | Less Than<br>Significant with<br>Mitigation<br>Incorporation | Less Than<br>Significant<br>Impact | No<br>Impact |
|---|--------------------------------------|--|------------------------------------|--------------|
| a) Cause a substantial adverse change in<br>the significance of a historical resource as<br>defined in '15064.5?    |                                      |  | X                                  |              |
| b) Cause a substantial adverse change in<br>the significance of an archaeological<br>resource pursuant to '15064.5? |                                      |  | Х                                  |              |
| c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?             |                                      |  | X                                  |              |
| d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?                                |                                      |  | ×                                  |              |

#### DISCUSSION

# a), b), c), d) Less Than Significant Impact.

Adoption of the proposed will not adversely affect archaeological or paleontological resources, or disturb any human remains. Although implementation of some of the

management tasks described in the proposed LMP would involve minimal land disturbance (e.g., restoration or enhancement activities, installation of fencing or signage), the goals and tasks in the LMP include protection measures for cultural resources including the following:

- 1) conducting cultural resource surveys prior to ground disturbance,
- 2) consultation with a qualified archaeologist in the case of an inadvertent discovery,
- 3) submittal of resource documentation to the California Historical Resources Information System and the National Register of Historic Places, and
- 4) submittal of resource evaluations to the State Historic Preservation Officer and the Office of Historic Preservation, as appropriate.

These measures would identify and protect any prehistoric and historic resources prior to ground disturbance; therefore, impacts to cultural resources would be less than significant.

| VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS<br>Would the project:  | Potentially<br>Significant<br>Impact | Less Than<br>Significant with<br>Mitigation<br>Incorporation | Less Than<br>Significant<br>Impact | No<br>Impact |
|--|--------------------------------------|--|------------------------------------|--------------|
| a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:   |                                      |  |                                    |              |
| i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42. |                                      |  |                                    | X            |
| ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?   |                                      |  |                                    | Х            |
| iii) Seismic-related ground failure,<br>including liquefaction?  |                                      |  |                                    | Х            |
| iv) Landslides?  |                                      |  |                                    | X            |
| b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?  |                                      |  | X                                  |              |
| c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?   |                                      |  |                                    | Х            |

| d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?                                     | X |
|--|---|
| e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water? | Х |

### a), c), d), e) No Impact.

LMP implementation will not change the current exposure risk to geologic hazards or expansive soils nor create a substantial risk to lives or property. The LMP does not specifically authorize or make a precommitment to any substantive physical changes to the Wildlife Area. With the exception of ongoing restoration and enhancement, and operations and maintenance activities, any substantive physical changes that are not currently approved will require subsequent authorizations.

The LMP does not include construction of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems nor would any be required as a result of the implementation of any of the LMP goals or tasks; therefore, implementation of the LMP would result in no impact.

# b) Less Than Significant Impact.

Implementation of some of the management tasks described in the proposed LMP could involve minimal ground disturbance (e.g., habitat restoration, enhancement or maintenance activities). These activities would be implemented using best management practices designed to minimize soil erosion and/or topsoil loss, and would be conducted in conformance with regulatory requirements regarding soil erosion (IVB, Goal 6.2, Task 6.2.6). Ultimately, the LMP proposes to restore fire damaged wildlife habitat (e.g., IVE, Goal 3; Appendices E and G) and the results will be beneficial, reducing topsoil loss through wind erosion.

| VII. HAZARDS AND<br>HAZARDOUS MATERIALS<br>Would the project:   | Potentially<br>Significant<br>Impact | Less Than<br>Significant with<br>Mitigation<br>Incorporation | Less Than<br>Significant<br>Impact | No<br>Impact |
|---|--------------------------------------|--|------------------------------------|--------------|
| a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?   |                                      |  | X                                  |              |
| b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment? |                                      |  | х                                  |              |

| c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?  |  |   | Х |
|--|--|---|---|
| d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?                                   |  |   | Х |
| e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? |  |   | X |
| f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?  |  |   | Х |
| g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?  |  |   | Х |
| h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?   |  | X |   |
|  |  |   |   |

## a), b) Less Than Significant Impact.

HJWA LMP implementation does not require the routine use, transport or disposal of hazardous materials; however, some of the management tasks could potentially expose people or the environment to such hazards (e.g., use of heavy equipment, pesticides/herbicides during restoration or enhancement activities, and potential hazardous materials in existing structures). The LMP requires a hazardous materials assessment be conducted prior to substantial ground disturbance or structural improvement activities. Likewise, prior to any herbicide or pesticide use, the LMP requires that the proposed areas be surveyed for sensitive biological resources and treated by a certified applicator using appropriate disclosure procedures, avoidance strategies and safety precautions to limit exposure and prevent accidental releases (IVB Goals; Appendix E). Due to the safety provisions discussed above, less than significant impacts are expected for hazardous materials handling or accidental release.

# c), d), e), f), g) No Impact.

The Wildlife Area is not located within a quarter mile of a school; therefore, children will not be exposed to any hazardous materials. There are no public or private airports within two miles of the Wildlife Area; therefore LMP adoption will

not pose any safety hazards to aircraft or people residing or working in the project area.

A computerized database search of various agency lists was conducted for the Wildlife Area and surrounding properties to identify potential hazardous contamination sites; none were found (Environmental Protection Agency 2009). The LMP goals and tasks include drafting an emergency response plan for the HJWA in coordination with other local and federal first responder agencies (IVE, Goal 2, Tasks 2.1.1-2.1.6). Net project impacts related to emergency response would be beneficial.

### h) Less than Significant Impact.

The Wildlife Area is located in a region where wildfire is a serious concern and a large portion of the area was damaged by recent wildfires. The LMP's fire management goals and accompanying tasks (IVE, Goal 2) would decrease potential risks of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires. Net project impacts related to wildfire hazards would be beneficial.

| VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY Would the project:   | Potentially<br>Significant<br>Impact | Less Than<br>Significant with<br>Mitigation<br>Incorporation | Less Than<br>Significant<br>Impact | No<br>Impact |
|--|--------------------------------------|--|------------------------------------|--------------|
| a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?  |                                      |  |                                    | Х            |
| b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of preexisting nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)? |                                      |  |                                    | X            |
| c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation onor off-site?   |                                      |  |                                    | X            |
| d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding onor off-site?  |                                      |  |                                    | X            |

| e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff? |  | Х |
|---|--|---|
| f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?   |  | × |
| g) Place housing within a 100-year flood<br>hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood<br>Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate<br>Map or other flood hazard delineation map?         |  | X |
| h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?   |  | Х |
| i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?                    |  | Х |
| j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?   |  | Х |

# a), b), c), d), e), f), g), h), i), j) No Impact.

Adoption and implementation of the proposed LMP do not include any actions that will result in violations of water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. Proposed LMP goals or tasks will not affect groundwater recharge, involve the use of storm drain systems, construct homes or structures that increase surface or polluted runoff nor impede or redirect flood flows. Therefore, adoption and implementation of the LMP would not threaten storm drain capacity, increase 100-year flood hazards, or increase flooding risks as a result of the failure of a levee or dam.

The proposed LMP requires all water related goals and tasks meet the applicable regulatory requirements protecting aquatic habitats and water quality, such as CDFG, USFWS, and SWRCB standards, as well as Section 404 of the Clean Water Act and any applicable local water resource protection plans or ordinances (IVB, Goal 6.2, Tasks 6.2.5-6.2.7). The goal of riparian habitat enhancement along Balls Creek, Purdy Creek and Long Valley Creek is to ultimately improve water quality, groundwater recharge and wildlife habitat in the Long Valley Creek watershed.

| IX. LAND USE Would the project:   | Potentially<br>Significant<br>Impact | Less Than<br>Significant with<br>Mitigation<br>Incorporation | Less Than<br>Significant<br>Impact | No<br>Impact |
|---|--------------------------------------|--|------------------------------------|--------------|
| a) Physically divide an established community?  |                                      |  |                                    | Х            |
| b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect? |                                      |  |                                    | X            |
| c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?   |                                      |  |                                    | х            |

#### a), b), c) No Impact.

The draft HJWA LMP would not require any physical changes to an established community, nor would implementation of any activity following LMP adoption physically divide an established community. LMP adoption and implementation requires no changes to existing land uses in the Wildlife Area. The LMP has been developed in conformance with land management plans (e.g., general plans) for Sierra and Lassen Counties. The LMP goals provide for natural resource protection and preservation, and require that any projects implemented following LMP adoption conform to local or regional habitat conservation and natural community conservation plans that may be applicable at that time. The LMP also outlines resource coordination opportunities between agencies and interested parties to facilitate communication and information sharing so that no conflicts will arise in the future (Appendix H). Based upon these provisions no land use impacts will occur.

| X. MINERAL RESOURCES Would the project:   | Potentially<br>Significant<br>Impact | Less Than<br>Significant with<br>Mitigation<br>Incorporation | Less Than<br>Significant<br>Impact | No<br>Impact |
|---|--------------------------------------|--|------------------------------------|--------------|
| a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?                                |                                      |  | х                                  |              |
| b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan? |                                      |  | Х                                  |              |

## DISCUSSION

## a), b) Less Than Significant Impact.

LMP implementation will not involve any resource extraction or mining. Presently mineral extraction on the Wildlife Area is not permitted, as it would conflict with CDFG's current mission to manage for ecological values and wildlife-related public

uses. Nevertheless, the draft LMP serves as a general policy guide for the management of the HJWA. It does not specifically authorize or make a precommitment to any substantive physical changes to the Wildlife Area. With the exception of ongoing restoration and enhancement, operations and maintenance activities, any substantive physical changes that are not currently approved will require subsequent authorizations. Thus, the HJWA LMP contains no tasks that establish facilities, structures, or land uses that would physically or economically preclude mineral extraction in the future, if such a public policy decision were made and any potential mineral resource impacts are less than significant.

| XI. NOISE Would the project result in:  | Potentially<br>Significant<br>Impact | Less Than<br>Significant with<br>Mitigation<br>Incorporation | Less Than<br>Significant<br>Impact | No<br>Impact |
|---|--------------------------------------|--|------------------------------------|--------------|
| a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?   |                                      |  |                                    | X            |
| b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?   |                                      |  |                                    | х            |
| c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?  |                                      |  |                                    | х            |
| d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?  |                                      |  |                                    | х            |
| e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? |                                      |  |                                    | х            |
| f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?  |                                      |  |                                    | х            |

#### DISCUSSION

#### a), b), c), d) e), f) No Impact.

Although implementation of some of the management tasks described in the proposed LMP could involve the intermittent use of construction equipment (e.g., restoration, enhancement or maintenance activities) thus temporarily increasing ambient noise, these activities would not result in a substantial increase in ambient noise or groundborne vibration levels above those generated by existing management practices or public uses. Since any increase in ambient noise will be temporary, and due to the isolated nature of the area, people in the vicinity will not be exposed to excessive noise levels or significantly impacted.

In addition, prior to implementation of any projects that are consistent with the LMP, CDFG would subject them to CEQA review according to CEQA Guidelines Section 15168, in light of the information in this document, to determine if additional CEQA documentation in necessary. The type of additional CEQA review completed would be determined based on CEQA Guidelines Sections 15162-15164.

| XII. POPULATION AND<br>HOUSING Would the project:   | Potentially<br>Significant<br>Impact | Less Than<br>Significant with<br>Mitigation<br>Incorporation | Less Than<br>Significant<br>Impact | No<br>Impact |
|---|--------------------------------------|--|------------------------------------|--------------|
| a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)? |                                      |  |                                    | Х            |
| b) Displace substantial numbers of existing<br>housing, necessitating the construction of<br>replacement housing elsewhere?   |                                      |  |                                    | X            |
| c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?   |                                      |  |                                    | х            |

#### **DISCUSSION**

# a), b), c) No Impact.

The proposed LMP does not involve any change in housing nor would it induce growth through new infrastructure or by removing any barriers to growth. Implementation of some of the management goals and tasks may require additional staff hours, but not to the extent that would require additional housing. LMP adoption and implementation would have no impact on population or housing.

| XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES Would the project:  | Potentially<br>Significant<br>Impact | Less Than<br>Significant with<br>Mitigation<br>Incorporation | Less Than<br>Significant<br>Impact | No<br>Impact |
|---|--------------------------------------|--|------------------------------------|--------------|
| a) Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services: |                                      |  |                                    |              |
| Fire protection?  |                                      |  |                                    | X            |
| Police protection?  |                                      |  |                                    | Х            |
| Schools?  |                                      |  |                                    | X            |
| Parks?  |                                      |  |                                    | Х            |
| Other public facilities?  |                                      |  |                                    | Х            |

# a) Less Than Significant Impact.

Proposed LMP adoption would not require substantial changes to existing public service levels. Implementation of the public use, facilities, and fire management goals (LMP, IVE) could require a minimal increase in staff hours per year by the fire department, the County Sheriff's department, and CDFG staff, but these potential minimal increases do not create the need for new or altered facilities.

| XIV. RECREATION Would the project:   | Potentially<br>Significant<br>Impact | Less Than<br>Significant with<br>Mitigation<br>Incorporation | Less Than<br>Significant<br>Impact | No<br>Impact |
|--|--------------------------------------|--|------------------------------------|--------------|
| a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated? |                                      |  | ×                                  |              |
| b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?                        |                                      |  | х                                  |              |

#### **DISCUSSION**

# a), b) Less Than Significant Impact.

The HJWA's overall recreation goal is to provide a variety of public uses to the extent that such uses do not have significant adverse impacts on biological resources. Suitable recreational activities for the area are those that are either wildlife dependent or related and have low to moderate potential to negatively affect wildlife or conflict with other uses (LMP, Section IV, 6, 7) Management Goal D). HJWA LMP adoption and implementation do not expand the Wildlife Area or change existing levels of wildlife-dependent recreational use. The existing use restrictions, coupled with the remoteness and limited access to the area, help ensure the number of recreational users will not exceed the carrying capacity of the natural resources or degrade existing natural features or recreational facilities.

| XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC Would the project:  | Potentially<br>Significant<br>Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation | Less Than<br>Significant<br>Impact | No<br>Impact |
|--|--------------------------------------|---|------------------------------------|--------------|
| a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)? |                                      |   |                                    | х            |
| b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?   |                                      |   |                                    | X            |
| c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location, that result in substantial safety risks?  |                                      |   |                                    | ×            |
| d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?   |                                      |   |                                    | X            |
| e) Result in inadequate emergency access?  |                                      |   |                                    | X            |
| f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?  |                                      |   |                                    | X            |
| g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?   |                                      |   |                                    | х            |

# a), b), c), d), e), f), g) No Impact.

There are no predicted increases in HJWA use levels following LMP adoption. No design changes are proposed for current road access, nor are any changes anticipated with traffic patterns; therefore, no traffic hazards are anticipated. Since changes to current traffic levels or patterns are not anticipated, no changes to emergency access or parking would result from plan adoption, and the plan would not interfere with alternative transportation.

| XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE<br>SYSTEMS Would the project:  | Potentially<br>Significant<br>Impact | Less Than<br>Significant with<br>Mitigation<br>Incorporation | Less Than<br>Significant<br>Impact | No<br>Impact |
|---|--------------------------------------|--|------------------------------------|--------------|
| a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?   |                                      |  |                                    | х            |
| b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?                            |                                      |  |                                    | х            |
| c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?                                     |                                      |  |                                    | Х            |
| d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?  |                                      |  |                                    | Х            |
| e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments? |                                      |  |                                    | X            |
| f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?  |                                      |  |                                    | X            |
| g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?   |                                      |  |                                    | ×            |

# a), b), c), d), e), f), g) No Impact.

Anticipated HJWA use levels will remain the same following LMP adoption. The LMP does not include a proposal for additional storm drain facilities, additional water supplies, additional wastewater treatment, or additional solid waste disposal. Neither LMP adoption nor goal and task implementation activities would require the construction of new residences or service-related facilities; and therefore, would not generate a new demand for or change existing storm drain facilities, water supply levels, wastewater treatment, or solid waste disposal.

| XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE Would the project:  | Potentially<br>Significant<br>Impact | Less Than<br>Significant with<br>Mitigation<br>Incorporation | Less Than<br>Significant<br>Impact | No<br>Impact |
|--|--------------------------------------|--|------------------------------------|--------------|
| a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory? |                                      |  | Х                                  |              |
| b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)   |                                      |  | х                                  |              |
| c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?  |                                      |  | ×                                  |              |

#### a), b), c) Less than Significant Impact.

LMP adoption as well as goal and task implementation would help preserve and enhance natural resources. Some LMP implementation activities could have the potential for impacts to biological and cultural resources, e.g., restoration or enhancement activities (see Environmental Impacts IV and V, above). However, LMP goals and tasks include avoidance strategies, protection measures, and best management practices that would eliminate or minimize potential impacts to less-than-significant levels. Additionally, all conducted activities would follow applicable regulatory requirements and many of the goals and tasks are designed to have a net benefit to these resources. Furthermore, because no large scale projects are anticipated which could threaten entire populations or communities, adoption of the proposed LMP will not cause a significant impact to these biological or cultural resources.

Proposed LMP adoption and implementation would not require any substantial infrastructure improvements or new construction. All LMP implementation activities will follow applicable regulatory requirements as well as the protective measures, avoidance strategies and best management practices incorporated therein. In addition, the proposed goals and tasks are designed to provide a net benefit to environmental conditions. Therefore, although there is a potential for some temporary and less than significant impacts to the environment as described above, none of these impacts are cumulatively considerable.

The proposed project is a land management plan, with no construction or substantive physical changes proposed. The proposed LMP project continues or improves existing uses and environmental resources of the Hallelujah Junction Wildlife Area. LMP implementation would also comply with all applicable laws and regulations. As a result, adoption of the LMP's goals and tasks would not have any direct or indirect environmental effects which would cause substantial adverse effects on human beings.

#### REFERENCES

- California Department of Conservation, Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program. 2006. Sierra Valley Important Farmland 2006. Accessed Online: <a href="ftp://ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub/dlrp/FMMP/pdf/2006/srv06.pdf">ftp://ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub/dlrp/FMMP/pdf/2006/srv06.pdf</a>
- Environmental Protection Agency, 2008. Envirofacts Data Warehouse. Accessed Online: <a href="http://www.epa.gov/enviro">http://www.epa.gov/enviro</a>.
- Northern Sierra Air Quality Management District. 2005. Annual Air Quality Monitoring Report. Accessed online:

  <a href="http://myairdistrict.com/Annual\_Report">http://myairdistrict.com/Annual\_Report</a>
  Full\_version.pdf
- Sierra County Planning Department. 2005. GIS Data File: Parcel Boundaries with Limited Roll Data.